

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_130461
Title of the Manuscript:	Knowledge of Liquid Biofertilizers among the Soybean Growers in Marathwada region of Maharashtra
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is significant for the scientific community as it provides valuable insights into the knowledge and adoption levels of liquid biofertilizers among soybean farmers in India, particularly in the Marathwada region. By highlighting knowledge gaps and identifying factors influencing adoption, the study contributes to the growing body of research focused on sustainable agricultural practices and eco-friendly inputs	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the article, " Knowledge and adoption of liquid biofertilizers among the soybean growers, " is suitable as it clearly reflects the main focus of the study.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract provides a basic overview of the study, including its objectives, methodology, and some key findings, but it lacks comprehensiveness. While it mentions the location, sample size, data collection method, and statistical tools, the information is not well-structured and cohesive. It can be improved in the following ways <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The abstract could be better structured into distinct sections: <i>Introduction, Methods, Results, and Conclusion</i>. This would enhance readability and clarity. While some specific knowledge areas (e.g., recommended application methods) are mentioned, the abstract lacks details on the level of adoption and its relationship with the independent variables. 	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is scientifically accurate and methodologically sound. Major improvements in citation details and major improvements in statistical reporting, and data verification can enhance its rigor.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references mentioned in the manuscript are incomplete and lack proper bibliographic details. While the citations reference specific studies and reports (e.g., Bodake, Adhayage, Kharmale, Soybean Outlook 2022, and AINP SBB), they are not sufficiently detailed or recent in their presentation. Include recent peer-reviewed studies that provide updated insights into biofertilizer efficiency and applications. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bhardwaj, D., Ansari, M. W., Sahoo, R. K., & Tuteja, N. (2014). Biofertilizers function as key player in sustainable agriculture by improving soil fertility, plant tolerance, and crop productivity. <i>Microbial Cell Factories</i>, 13(1), 66. https://doi.org/10.1186/1475-2859-13-66 	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language in the manuscript is clear and suitable for scholarly communication	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sajad Ali
Department, University & Country	Government Post Graduate College of Management Sciences Peshawar, Pakistan